



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/709,528	05/12/2004	David R. Stauffer	BUR920030196US1	3527
23550	7590	10/11/2006	EXAMINER	
HOFFMAN WARNICK & D'ALESSANDRO, LLC			PARIHAR, SUCHIN	
75 STATE STREET			ART UNIT	
14TH FLOOR			PAPER NUMBER	
ALBANY, NY 12207			2825	

DATE MAILED: 10/11/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/709,528

Applicant(s)

STAUFFER ET AL.

Examiner

Suchin Parihar

Art Unit

2825

– The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address –
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 July 2006.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 8-12 and 14-19 is/are rejected.
7) ☒ Claim(s) 7, 13 and 20 is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This office action is response to application 10/709,528, filed on 5/12/2004, amendment filed on 7/6/2006. The Abstract is amended. Claims 1, 8 and 14 are currently amended. Claims 1-20 are pending in this application.

Applicant's arguments filed 7/6/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicable rejections from the prior office action are incorporated herein.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. **Claim 1-6, 8-12 and 14-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)** as being anticipated by Choukalos et al. (6,425,109).

3. With respect to claims 1, 8 and 14, Choukalos teaches a method, system and computer program product comprising the steps of: defining at least one system characteristic (pin groups G0, G1 and G2 of Figure 3 ASIC system, also see Col 4, lines 21-45); generating a core/pin rule (i.e. pin configuration rules, see Col 3, lines 49-67) for the design that defines each core of the design (the elements of Figure 3, considered as cores, have their structures defined, see Col 4, lines 21-45), each pin of each core and corresponding pin attributes (pin and pin names are described, Col 4, lines 21-45), the core/pin rule including pin class rules (a set of process steps [i.e. rules] for pins which

Art Unit: 2825

are in a special group [i.e. class], Col 6, lines 18-25); constructing class-type inference rules (NOTE: applicant's examples of class-type inference rules on page 13 of the specification; also see Choukalos: a designer defines relationship between core inputs and outputs [wired-relationship] by writing source code to define the functionality of the core(s), see Col 3, lines 55-67) based on the pin class rules for automatically generating the datapath system (create high-level source by interconnecting cores, i.e. creating datapath system for ASIC, see Figure 2), each class-type inference rule executing at least one primitive function (design connectivity is checked against the physical and logical rules in the PCS, i.e. checking the relationship between input and output pins, Col 4, lines 12-20; Examiner Notes that, on page 56 of the specification, the test_class_structure primitive function checks the relationship between the number of input pins and output pins –i.e. checking the relationship between input and output pins).

4. With respect to claims 2, 9 and 15, Choukalos teaches all the elements of claims 1, 8 and 14, from which the claims depend respectively. Choukalos teaches: defining a set of cores to be used in the datapath system (user selects the core chiplets that the user desires to be integrated into the core, Col 4, lines 2-5; also see Col 3, lines 30-34 wherein it is stated that a chiplet is merely a core of relatively low complexity); and defining each stage of each core (see Col 4, Table 1; also see discussion of Pin Configuration Structures, Col 3, lines 55-67); and establishing a link order name for each stage (see Col 4, Table 1: LINK_NAME and Link_ORDER). With respect to claim

Art Unit: 2825

9 alone, Choukalos teaches: means for identifying any global attributes for a plurality of pins (creating a global signal name out of LINK_NAME, Col 4, line 38).

5. With respect to claims 3 and 16, Choukalos teaches all the elements of claims 2 and 15, from which the claims depend respectively. Choukalos teaches: identifying any global attributes for a plurality of pins (creating a global signal name out of LINK_NAME, Col 4, line 38).

6. With respect to claims 4, 10 and 17, Choukalos teaches all the elements of claims 1, 8 and 14, from which the claims depend respectively. Choukalos teaches: bundling pins of each stage according to at least one class (see Figure 4, Controller 40 has 3 pins of the same class: ROM_ADDR_0, ROM_ADDR_1, ROM_ADDR_2), each class indicating a common wiring parameter for the pins (all three ROM_ADDR pins have same LINK_NAME, see Col 4, lines 35-40), wherein the class is a pin attribute (the class name may be considered the LINK_NAME itself, wherein the LINK_NAME is a pin attribute for those pins within the same class); categorizing each class as one of a plurality of datapath system class-types (LINK_NAMES may become a global signal name for the entire design, see Col 4, lines 35-40); bundling pins according to at least one channel identifier (G2 is a channel identifier for the pin group G2, see Figures 3, #40), wherein the channel identifier is a pin attribute (see the Group_ID attribute in Table 1 of Figure 4); and generating the core/pin rule that defines each core of the design (the elements of Figure 3, considered as cores, have their structures defined, see Col 4, lines 21-45), each pin of each core and corresponding pin attributes.

Art Unit: 2825

7. With respect to claim 5, 11 and 18, Choukalos teaches all the elements of claims 4, 10 and 17, from which the claims depend respectively. Choukalos teaches: assigning a vector index to each pin within a multiple pin core having more than one pin with the same class and channel identifier (see the indices 0,1 and 2 of #40 in Figure 3), wherein the vector index is a pin attribute (see the Group I.D. entry of Table 1 in Col 4, which may have an index as its value, i.e. 0, 1 etc.).

8. With respect to claims 6, 12 and 19, Choukalos teaches all the elements of claims 4, 10 and 17, from which the claims depend respectively. Choukalos teaches: bundling pins according to at least one global attribute (class names like LINK_NAMES becoming global signal names, Col 4, lines 35-40), each global attribute indicating a common global parameter of the pins.

Allowable Subject Matter

9. Claims 7, 13 and 20 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

10. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: The prior art made of record fails to teach all the limitations of each of claims 7, 13 and 20. Specifically, the prior art made of record fails to teach: establishing a set of primitive functions for use in constructing the class-type inference rules.

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments filed 7/6/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

12. Applicant asserts: Choukalos does not disclose “the core/pin rule including pin class rules”. Examiner disagrees with this assertion.

Figure 2 #31 of Choukalos, core and pin configuration rules are read [i.e. core/pin rules]. Also, Col 6 lines 18-25 recite pins of a special group [i.e. class], wherein if a pin belongs to a special group, all the pins of that group are connected together one-by-one to their link names [i.e. pin class rule].

13. Applicant asserts that Choukalos does not “construct class-type inference rules based on pin class rules”. Examiner disagrees with this assertion.

Examiner points out that Choukalos teaches: each class-type inference rule executing at least one primitive function (design connectivity is checked against the physical and logical rules in the PCS, i.e. checking the relationship between input and output pins, Col 4, lines 12-20; Examiner Notes that, on page 56 of the specification, the `test_class_structure` primitive function [i.e. example of class-type inference rule according to claim 1] checks the relationship between the number of input pins and output pins –i.e. design connectivity is checked).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

Art Unit: 2825

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Suchin Parihar whose telephone number is 571-272-6210. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, 8:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jack Chiang can be reached on 571-272-7483. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

PAUL DINH
PRIMARY EXAMINER



Suchin Parihar
Examiner
AU 2825